

Remarks

Upon entry of the foregoing amendment, claims 1-17, 19-21, and 23-26 are pending in the application, with claims 1, 14, and 21 being the independent claims. Claims 1, 6, 14, and 21 are sought to be amended, and claims 18 and 22 are sought to be canceled. These changes are believed to introduce no new matter, and their entry is respectfully requested. Based on the following remarks, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider all outstanding objections and rejections and that they be withdrawn.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1, 2, and 12-23 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,175,728 to Mitama (hereinafter " Mitama "). Applicants traverse this rejection based on the discussion below.

Claim 1 has been amended to clarify that the step of *determining said unwanted DC noise from said sampled signal, includes the step of filtering said sampled signal using a passband that includes 0 Hz so as to isolate said unwanted DC noise.* (see, Claim 1, *emphasis added*)

Whereas, Mitama teaches using a *delta-sigma modulator 210* to determine DC offset. (See, Mitama, FIG. 6-7, col. 6, lines 54-66) The delta sigma modulator 210 does not perform the step *filtering the sampled signal using a passband that includes 0 Hz so as to isolate said unwanted DC noise*, nor does the Office Action allege this.

Accordingly, Mitama does not teach each and every feature of claim 1, and therefore does not anticipate claim 1. It is further noted that the added *italicized* feature mentioned

above for claim 1, is a portion of (but not all of) the recitations that were recited in allowable claim 6. Further, a similar recitation is found in allowed claim 24.

Based on the discussion above, it is clear that Mitama does not disclose each and every feature of claim 1, and therefore does not anticipate claim 1. Accordingly, Applicants request that the rejection under 35 § U.S.C. 102(b) be removed and that claim 1 be passed to allowance. Claims 2-13 depend directly or indirectly from claim 1, and therefore are allowable for being dependent on an allowable base claim, in addition to their own patentable features.

Claim 14 has been amended to include the feature of *wherein said step of compensating comprises the step of determining the unwanted DC noise by filtering down-converted frequency spectrum around 0 Hz.* (See, amended claim 14)

Accordingly, independent claim 14 is allowable over Mitama for the same reasons as mentioned above for claim 1. Further, claims 15-17 and 19-20 depend directly or indirectly from claim 14, and are allowable for being dependent on an allowable base claim, in addition to their own patentable features.

Further, claim 21 has been amended to include the feature of *wherein said means for determining includes means for sampling said input signal, and means for filtering an output of said means for sampling using a passband that isolates signal spectrum around 0 Hz.* (See, amended claim 21). Accordingly, independent claim 21 is allowable over Mitama for the same reasons as mentioned above for claim 1. Further claim 23 depends directly from claim 21 and should be allowable for being dependent on an allowable base claim, in addition to its own patentable features.

Based on the discussion above, Applicants request that the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102 be reconsidered and removed, and that claims 1-17, 19-21, and 23 be passed to allowance.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claims 3-4 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mitama in view of Official Notice of TV channels. Applicants traverse below.

Claims 3-4 depend directly or indirectly from claim 1. As discussed above, claim 1 is allowable over Mitama for the reasons discussed above. Accordingly, claims 3-4 are allowable for being dependent on an allowable base claim in addition to their own patentable features.

Allowable Subject Matter

Applicants express appreciation for the indication that claims 24-26 are allowed, and that claims 5-11 are allowable if rewritten in independent form. However, based on the arguments above, Applicants believe that claims 5-11 are allowable as written, for being dependent on an allowable base claim 1 as amended herein.

Conclusion

All of the stated grounds of objection and rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicants therefore respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider all presently outstanding objections and rejections and that they be withdrawn. Applicants believe that a full and complete reply has been made to the outstanding Office Action and, as such, the present application is in condition for

allowance. If the Examiner believes, for any reason, that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at the number provided.

Prompt and favorable consideration of this Amendment and Reply is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

STERNE, KESSLER, GOLDSTEIN & FOX P.L.L.C.



Jeffrey T. Helvey
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No. 44,757

Date: 4/23/07

1100 New York Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20005-3934
(202) 371-2600

660762_1.DOC